

RECEIVED

MEMORANDUM

JUL 21 2005

PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION

TO: Main Case File
Kentucky Public Service Commission
Case No. 2005-00142
KU & LG&E joint Application for Transmission CCN

FROM: PSC Staff

DATE: July 21, 2005

RE: Summary of comments received at public hearing

The Kentucky Public Service Commission's (PSC) public hearing on Case #2005-00142, a joint Application for Transmission CCN submitted by Louisville Gas and Electric Company (LG&E) and Kentucky Utilities (KU), convened at 6:05 P.M. EDT on Tuesday, July 12, 2005, at the Pritchard Community Center in Elizabethtown, Kentucky.

Present were PSC Chairman Mark David Goss, Commissioner Greg Coker, and members of the PSC staff.

One hundred fourteen members of the public signed in at the hearing. Of these, twenty-eight individuals made oral comments to the PSC. Two people also submitted written comments. The proceeding was videotaped.

Chairman Goss opened the meeting with introductions, a brief overview of the public hearing process, topics within the Commission's jurisdiction, and an explanation of the purpose of the particular hearing. The Chairman asked that public commentary be limited to three minutes per individual.

John Wolfram, Manager of Regulatory Affairs for LG&E & KU, opened with a brief presentation of the companies' filing and provided a written handout containing the background and overview of the proposed project, as well as reasons for the need for the proposed line.

Hank Graddy, an attorney representing property owners Dennis and Cathy Cunningham, spoke next and indicated that he had filed a motion asking the PSC to dismiss the LG&E/KU application without prejudice. He then proceeded to give reasons as to why the application should be dismissed.

Robert Kiefer was slated to present next, but was not present.

The public comments were as follows:

- **Leslie Barras**, Associate Director of Riverfields, a non-profit land and river conservancy organization, stated that both historic properties and the environment would be endangered if the transmission line were to be built. She urged the Commission to defer the application until a more comprehensive study could be conducted—a study (outside of any that LG&E/KU have already conducted) that would provide both an environmental assessment as well as an assessment of the impact upon historical properties within the realm of the transmission line.
- **Bobby Estes** stated that he and other property owners do not have enough information to know whether or not the transmission line is really needed at this point in time. He feels that the line would “mess up people’s lives” and would destroy valuable trees and property. He urged the Commission to “make sure it’s necessary” before approving the line.
- **Dan Barragan** urged the Commission to reexamine the application because he feels as though the line is unnecessary at this time and would be of no benefit to the people in the community. He expressed concern about the high voltage the power line would emit and about the effect the emission would have upon children’s health. He asked the Commission to examine alternative routes and alternative ways to generate energy—ways that would protect people and the environment.
- **Connie Morris** requested that the required line of site surveys be conducted on Ft. Duffield (in West Point, Ky) and other historic sites adjacent to this proposed project. She went on to add that when a private company stands to financially profit at the expense of private property owners, it is the responsibility of state and federal agencies to implement the regulations set in place to protect everyone’s interest.
- **Rosyelle Moore**, who serves on the West Point City Council, says that as a councilperson, she needs to understand the impact that a new and improved transmission line will have upon the community, the residents, and tourists. She said that “tourism is the lifeblood of West Point”. She feels that a line of site visualization needs to be conducted before any action is taken and also wants a show of need for the new line.
- **Bob Griffith**, an attorney for and president of Clarkson Farm Inc., owns a home that is on the National Register of Historic Homes. He stated that Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires a process that analyzes the effects on and mitigation for impacts on historic properties—including his house and Ft. Duffield. He added that this lengthy process requires the participation of the State Historic Preservation Officer—and until this process is complete, he urged the Commission to dismiss the application. He feels that LG&E/KU is “shortcutting” the process and wondered why a route through Ft. Knox was not considered for the line.

- **Mary Jent** (120 acres) stated that the proposed transmission line would cut her sixty year old family farm in half. She said that her youngest son wants to buy the farm to raise his two daughters—ages 3, and 1 month. She added that the line would be less than 500 feet from both her house and the house that her son wants to build. She wondered if any of the people from LG&E/KU (that want the line built) would want to raise their children in such an area. She feels that the line is not needed.
- **Diane Owsley** commented on behalf of herself and her mother, Violet Monroe. She claimed that the transmission line would cross 1/3 of her mother's property and would make a significant portion of the property unusable. She said that her mother's financial loss would be significant if the power line were to be built. She went on to express concern about the effects of electromagnetic exposure on the health of children and animals. She also expressed concern about the welfare of the environment and wants an alternative route to be examined and doesn't want unnecessary destruction of land if an alternative route can be found. She asked the PSC to reject the proposal. Ms. Owsley also submitted written comments.
- **Dennis Cunningham** (153 acres) claimed that the proposed line would cut his farm in half. He said that there are conflicting reports on whether or not more power is in fact needed in the area—he feels that more power is not needed. He feels that the sole purpose of the new line is to make a profit by moving power to new grids. He wants the alternatives to be closely examined—he thinks that more economical and environmental studies need to be conducted. He feels that the money that would be spent on the project would be better spent elsewhere—by improving and maintaining the current distribution and transmission systems—not by building new ones.
- **Betty Coyle** (80 acres) claimed that the proposed line would cut her property in half. She feels that the line is simply not needed—*she* does not need it.
- **Paula Gaddis** wondered why (if there is indeed a real need for more energy) existing lines or other existing corridors cannot be utilized instead of creating a new line. She also questioned why a permit is being sought now when the project “isn't scheduled to take place for fifteen years”—especially since technology may advance significantly in that time, offering alternatives.
- **Betsy Bennett**, an attorney in Hank Graddy's office, and a representative of the Cumberland Chapter of Sierra Club, feels that the proposal is premature at best, given that the need for a second power plant in Trimble County has not been confirmed. She said that Sierra Club's focus is “preserving prime farmland, preserving the rural landscape of Kentucky, and preventing suburban sprawl”. She asked that the Commission deny the application. Ms. Bennett also submitted written comments.

- **Irene Dodson** (45 acres) stated that the proposed line would cross the majority of the best cropland of her farm and would decrease the resale value of her property by fifty percent or more. She also expressed her concern about the possibility of cancer causing emissions resulting from the high voltage line. She questioned why a transmission line that is not needed for at least ten years—which might never be needed—must be built now. She wondered why the companies won't deal with the need when the need actually arises—routed along existing easement areas instead of land that is used for other valuable purposes.
- **Eugene Sheeran**, a full time farmer, urged the Commission to delay or deny the approval of the transmission line in question, at least until the approval of the Trimble County plant. He feels the line will negatively impact the quality of life in the rural areas of Meade and Hardin Counties, of which his farm is a part. He added that the proposed line will hurt the value of the land, as it is hard to farm around power lines. He said that the line will be detrimental to his personal and financial future. He also urged the energy companies (in the future) to use right of ways that are already designated for industrial use and not to use irreplaceable land for transmission lines.
- **Larry Edelen** (300 acres) expressed his concern about the potential negative impact the proposed transmission line would have upon his expensive GPS equipment, especially a line of such high voltage—he feels it would undoubtedly derail the usefulness and accuracy of the GPS, which he uses daily in his livelihood as a farmer. He doesn't feel that the line is necessary in any way.
- **Mike & Hellen Clair** (2 acres) stated that the transmission line would cut through half of an acre of their land, making it unusable. Mr. Clair said the right of way of the proposed line would “go through my living room” and would significantly devalue his home. He went on to ask why the line needs to be built now, without the approval of the Trimble County plant. He also expressed concern about the radiation emissions caused by the line and the effect these emissions would have upon his pre-existing health issues. He informed the Commission that he is a kidney transplant recipient and as a result has a medically maintained purposefully suppressed immune system, which makes him very susceptible to diseases such as cancer—thus he has to be extremely cautious of exposure to sunlight and radiation. Mrs. Clair expressed her concern about the possibility of being forced to move (to avoid the radiation) and having to locate handicap-accessible housing.
- **James K. Thompson** (52 acres), who operates a family-owned farm, feels that the proposed line would devalue his property. He questions why the companies haven't looked at alternate routes for the line—he feels that they are wanting to use the rural route as “cheaper land”, thus taking an unfair advantage over the people living in the area. He urged the Commission to deny the application and “save the family farms”.

- **Cathy Cunningham** (153 acres) feels that having another 345KV line would be redundant since there are already two 345KV lines coming in to the Elizabethtown substation. She thinks that Kentucky must follow the leads of other states such as California, Washington, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, that have enacted laws that dictate the enforcement of environmentally sound initiatives that require power companies to first use any pre-existing corridors (before constructing new lines). She added that every time a new coal-fired plant goes into production, citizens are being poisoned by the mercury that is emitted from the plants. She urged the PSC to deny the LG&E/KU request.
- **Samuel Coyle** (29 acres) said that the line would cut his forest land diagonally and would greatly hurt him financially and take away his land “forever”. He added that his mother also owns property that would be cut in half by the proposed line. He asked the Commission to deny permanently, not delay, the application.
- **Annette Straney** (300 acres/450 acres) stated that two of her farms would be affected and cut in half by the proposed power line. She added that her GPS equipment would, like Larry Edelen’s, be negatively affected by the line.
- **Dan Hardaway**, who has a farm that has been in his family since 1814, stated that the proposed line would cut straight through his property. He feels that this grid proposal is totally unnecessary and that LG&E/KU have other options that they can use to move the power. He opposes the plan and requests that the companies withdraw it.
- **Lesia Brewer** (110 acres) stated that the line would cut her land in half. She said the line would also cut into the land of her elderly parents-in-law, forcing them to relocate. She feels that the companies have not adequately examined the repercussions that will be felt by the families who live in the area.
- **Polly Gentry** (160 acres) feels that she and her family are being forced to sacrifice their land in order for LG&E/KU to make a profit. She does not like that the companies “don’t care” who is affected by their proposed project.
- **William Kephart** (232 acres) stated that he stands in full support of the issues raised by previous speakers Hank Graddy, Bob Griffith, Leslie Barras, and Dennis and Cathy Cunningham. He added that the proposed line would cause the value of the land to substantially decrease and he urged the Commission to deny the application.
- **Mary Ann Kephart** (232 acres) implored LG&E/KU to consider the financial implications that would be suffered by the many people who were at the hearing, opposing the construction of the proposed transmission line. She asked the PSC to deny the application.
- **Mae Hatfield** (11 acres) stated that the line would come within 400 feet of her home, causing her concern about the effects of the radiation emissions. She went on to add that the line would render a large part of her land unusable—making it impossible to be farmed—thus eliminating any possibility of future income. She does not see a need for the line at this time and urged the PSC to oppose the proposal.

- **Eydie Coyle** expressed great concern for all of the different species of animals that live in the woodlands that would be affected by the proposed line. She does not see an immediate need for the line and wants the companies to examine alternate routes. She said that she believes in progress but not at the cost of the farmlands and animals.
- **Dennis Davis** stated that he had no problem with power plants, electrical lines, right-of-ways, or easements. He said his main concern lies with the fact that his two-year old son will be sleeping and playing within 600 feet of the proposed power line. He sees the need for power but feels as though the power line has been thrust upon the community with no concern for repercussions. He said that he wouldn't have knowingly built his house upon a utility corridor, had he known that a power line would cut through his land.

Public comments concluded at 8:00 P.M. EDT, at which point Chairman Goss invited the attendees to stay and meet with the utility representatives and PSC staff who would answer any further questions—the Chairman then adjourned the meeting.